THEOLOGY

.. L AUGUST, 1947 No. 326

Editorial

THE Archbishop of Canterbury was taking a risk when he invited
or three groups of theologians, each representing a different school
thought in the Church of England, to make a report to him on the
flict between the Catholic and Protestant traditions and the
sibility and conditions of a synthesis between them. For the
on might be interpreted as the lending of authoritative countenance
parate parties in the Church, and we take the words " Church "
"party" to be contradictory. The description of a party as a
nool of thought" has often partaken of the nature of a euphemism.
the Report, entitled *Catholicity; a Study in the Conflict of Christian
ditions in the West* (Dacre Press, 2s. 6d.), which has been presented to
Archbishop by the theologians of the "Catholic" school of thought
remove any misgivings about the wisdom of his action. It is the
duct of a school of thought in the best and highest sense of the term,
, so far from betraying party mentality, shows how it may be over-
e. It is to be hoped that if other reports are being produced they
be of a similar quality and will be informed by a similar temper.
is impossible in a brief notice to do justice to the range and content
e Report, to the method which it follows (which is its most admir-
feature), or to its wealth of constructive suggestion on many
logical themes. It should be read carefully, but not of course
ritically, by all Anglican theologians, and there could hardly be a
er starting-point for conversations with theologians of other
rches. The Report sets in the foreground the "wholeness" of the
pel and the Church, to which testimony is borne by the New
tament and the primitive tradition. Within this wholeness there
inevitable and wholesome tensions, which were held together in
unity of the Church. But from the first it was possible that they
ht lead to one-sided or lop-sided developments, and the schisms
h eventually occurred in the Church did in fact result in a frag-
tation of the primitive and inclusive unity and in distorted percep-
s of the truth. The schism between East and West was the most
strous example of this, and the Report calls attention to it before
ing to its assigned subject—namely, the separations and conflicts
have occurred in the West. Here an attempt is made to mark and
w out the truth and the falsehood, the strength and the weakness,
a) Orthodox Protestantism, (*b*) the Renaissance and Liberalism,
the Post-Tridentine Papal Communion, and to show how the truth
hich each bears witness has been distorted and sometimes turned
falsehood by its separation from, or negation of, the others and by
ss of "the authentic perspectives of apostolic Christianity." We are
this is the right method of studying the various forms of Christian

tradition, though we do not suppose that the authors have succeeded i applying it with equal justice and insight at every point.

This central part of the Report is not made to lead to the triumphan conclusion that Anglicanism now contains the whole of which the othe Western traditions contain only parts. The Report is a sincere an consistent piece of theological repentance. All divided Christendon without exception needs to repent of its one-sidedness and to seek t recover the wholeness of Catholicity. It is confessed that moder versions of Catholicism have a no less serious share than the variou forms of Protestantism in the sins of theological distortion and omission and the same must be said of every school of thought in the Anglica Communion. Unity and theological synthesis will be reached not b patching together the fragments of truth to which each tradition bear witness nor by abstracting from them a highest common factor, but by common and patient rediscovery of the norm of faith and order in it totality. If the Church of England has an advantage, it is that ther have providentially been secured to us conditions that are peculiarl favourable to this recovery of Catholicity. For we have never sub stituted for it any system of our own; "Anglicanism" was never heard o till the nineteenth century, and the Report would have done well t throw it overboard. The fact that we have no single system to defen should make it easier for us to be directed away from what is partial t what is whole. The way is open "for the Church of England to be school of synthesis over a wider field than any other Church i Christendom."

After the word "wholeness," the word "synthesis" is the key-word o the Report. This was determined by the terms of reference, but we thin it unfortunate. The word "reconciliation" would be better, an probably would better express what the authors intend. "Synthesis" suggests bringing together beliefs, notions, "isms," into a single syste of thought. Synthesizing is a human activity or ideal; God does no make syntheses. Moreover, persons and communities cannot b synthesized; but they can be reconciled. This is the work of God. Th way to unity is the way of response to the gift of God which is the Churc Universal and in which reconciliation awaits all who allow themselve to be drawn into it. And the Church Universal is not, as the Repo rightly says, an *ideal*; it *is*—beneath and within all our separate churches and traditions which are at once signs and distortions of i visibility. The Report could be misrepresented as implying that th wholeness of the Church *was* in the primitive period and will not b again until theologians have reached a new synthesis. Whereas wha we take it to mean is that the Holy Spirit is calling us all out of separa tion and one-sidedness into the fellowship of the total Church which there before us, which is the foundation on which we all stand despi our separate superstructures, and in which alone we shall be in position to appropriate the truth in its fulness since that can b received only in the fullness of communion.

Canon Law in the Church of England—I

IT is not often that a memorial addressed by discomfited clergymen to their fathers in God has the ring in it which sounds after seventy years. Nevertheless, a blast blown against Lambeth's walls by Dean Church and some eighty representative High Churchmen on April 1877, is worth the listening for to-day.

> "Believing, as we do [they said], in the presence in the Church of her Divine Head, we are convinced that what is required is not the mere interpretation, however skilful, of existing law, but the living voice of the Church clearly declaring down what the law shall be in the future."[1]

During the same month Archbishop Tait wrote words of another age, proper enough in their context, but sadly descriptive of half a century's dissipation of the Church's energies.

> "Our business is [he wrote] to decide what is historically and legally true, and not what is or is not desireable."[2]

The sympathies of the Archbishops' Commissioners on Canon Law lie manifestly with the first of these two statements: their object has been to find for the Church of England a way through the tangled wood of laws, canons, customs, judgments—centuries upon centuries of unpruned growth—out to some sunlit acre, where men can recognize their officers and officers their men, where one can hear the trumpet speak and know who calls the tune, where adjutants and subalterns can move between pavilions and the lines, where Christ's militiamen can form their companies to advance upon the foe. The mind of the Church now, her power to keep good order in the future, have been their overruling care. But does that good demand a breach with the past? Is "what is desireable" incompatible with "what is historically and legally true"? Must the Commissioners, to march with the Dean and his representative High Churchmen, break step with Archbishop Tait? Not altogether so. For the seven chapters of their Report[3] are a vindication of life *within* tradition, of the power of a national church to develop and adapt its government and discipline, yet in conformity with what is age-old if not eternal, world-wide if not universal, within the One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church. There are black patches in the history of canon law, in England as elsewhere: these no one would deny. But the tradition has held firm through them, and it is *within* the tradition, searching, sifting, and recasting in the traditional way, that these historians have laboured to answer the questions laid before them and to draft new canons for the government of the Church to-day. Whether in the canons tradition has cramped initiative it must be the Church's

---

[1] *Archbishop Campbell Tait*, by R. T. Davidson and W. Benham (1891), vol. ii, p. 289.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 292.
[3] *The Canon Law of the Church of England*. London. S.P.C.K. 1947. 15s.

study to decide. The Church owes the members of this Commission a debt she can discharge only by applying herself first to this study, then, where she approves, to enactment; and that without delay.

The Report.—The Commission was appointed in 1939, but it could not set to work until 1943. In addition to the present Archbishop of York its Chairman, and Canon Addleshaw its Secretary, it comprised, as finally constituted, one bishop (formerly master of a Cambridge college), two deans, one archdeacon, three eminent academic historians, a regius professor of moral and pastoral theology, a High Court judge, a provincial vicar-general, and two theologians serving parochial cures. Its terms of reference were:

> A. To consider and report on the questions:
>
> (1) What is the present status of Canon Law in England (*a*) as regards canons in force before the Reformation; (*b*) as regards canons made and promulgated since the Reformation? and
>
> (2) What method should be followed to determine which canons are to be regarded as obsolete and to provide the Church with a body of canons certainly operative and apart from which none would be operative or reasonably regarded as operative?
>
> B. To prepare, if after such consideration this seems expedient, a revised body of canons based on the conclusions reached under A above, for submission to the Convocations.

These it has answered, Section A in six historical chapters describing the origin and development of canon law with special reference to the Church of England, Section B with a draft of one hundred and thirty-four new canons, described in general terms in Chapter VII and annotated clause by clause with the object of making clear what is old or what is new, and in what tradition the new stands. This annotation is a beautiful example of historical precision. Mr. Justice Vaisey has contributed a Memorandum on "Lawful Authority." There is a bibliography of the more important works since Godolphin and Stillingfleet, and of the common source-books for the canon and relevant statute law; there are tables of statutes and cases and a competent index. The publishers have produced their most pleasing and satisfying theological book in the writer's memory; and if they were ever in a strait, whether to match with utility the parson's purse or with full tailoring the stature of their theme, who will not say having once refreshed his eyes, that they chose wisely? There *was* a clerk, and he unbeneficed, to whom

> "was lever have at his beddes heed
> *Twenty* bokes, clad in blak or reed . . .
> Than robes riche, or fithele, or gay sautrye. . . ."

Of the historical chapters of the Report I shall but draw out the main lines, adding comment or illustrative matter as I can. The argument of the Report is traced adequately in a Summary printed with it.

oundations.—It must be difficult for the ordinary layman, reading his church newspaper of elaborate and costly judicial proceedings settle some trivial ecclesiological squabble, to relate them to the rge to "bind" and to "loose" given by our Lord to His Apostles. the relation is there: ideally the authority to govern the Church l to judge ecclesiastical causes comes from Christ; and if the way m Galilee to an English Consistory Court is tortuous and obscure, historical study of canonical jurisprudence is the more necessary explain it. The *Report* begins with this commission of Christ, h His conferring upon the Church a *jus canonicum* analogous to t exercised in the Israel of old. And it is necessary that it should in here, for, both within and without, the government of an blished Church is not infrequently misunderstood. Thus a Jesuit her can win commendation in an English church paper for an icle in which this is the first of its many confusions:

"L'anglican est cet homme étrange qui adopte en théorie le magistère des teurs traditionnels ou le magistère de la voix intérieure, en admettant dans pratique celui du prince temporel. L'unité de l'anglicanisme est faite paradalement de l'acceptation simultanée par des individus de deux obédiences ductibles; ceux-là seuls l'estimeront fragile ou illusoire qui n'ont jamais pris le defi perpetuel jeté par le réel à la face de la logique."[1]

forget the divine authority of canonical government—as in an blished church there is a standing temptation to forget it—is to kept Erastianism and the subservience that term implies. To forget limitations set by Scripture upon canonical government, and its rpose and end in the glory of God by guiding men in the way of vation—as strong churchmen, legalistic men, "spiritual liberties" n, have in many ages tended to forget them—is to sink into ecclesticism, and the diversion of energy from proclaiming the Gospel o obsessed disputations of matters indifferent. To forget again t canonical jurisprudence is a science with principles of its own interpreting laws and adapting institutions to succeeding needs—since the seventeenth century the Church of England as a whole s found it easy to forget—is to fetter liberty, to destroy real thority, and to invite men to bring in what they will, for no better son than that it is "old," or that it is "new," or that it is done, all we say, elsewhere. Therefore the first chapter of the *Report* is ndamental: it explains the source, nature, limitations, and purse of canon law, with the need of a living canonical jurisprudence; d it explains them well.

Customs, Councils, and Decretals.—Chapters II and III carry us m the patristic age to the Reformation. In them are sweetly disled the researches of Professors Fournier and Le Bras into the rliest canon law books of the Western Church, and of the late Dr N. Brooke into those in use in the English provinces. The result is mly to establish the theory first championed by F. W. Maitland (in *oman Canon Law in the Church of England,* 1898) as against

[1] J. Gonsette, S.J., "Regards sur l'anglicanisme contemporain," in *Nouvelle evue Théologique,* t. 69, no. 2; février, 1947, p. 153.

William Stubbs and the *Report of the Ecclesiastical Courts Commission, 1883*—namely, that

> "The English Church recognized the same law as the rest of the Church; it possessed and used the same collections of Church law that were employed in the rest of the Church. There is no shred of evidence to show that the English Church in the eleventh and twelfth centuries was governed by laws selected by itself."[1]

A close study of these two chapters is necessary for a proper understanding of the Commission's answers to the questions put before it, and of the canons (with their annotations) proposed.

Chapter II is concerned with the *Jus Antiquum,* the law of the first twelve centuries, culminating in the *Decretum* of Gratian, *circa* 1140. We are directed first to the emergence of canon law in the constituent provinces of the Western Church, where diocesan bishops issued regulations for their own local affairs, often simply as definitions of existing custom. Then, to meet a need of uniformity, the bishops met in councils to define their common policy in their own district—at Elvira for Spain (*circa* 300), at Arles for the West (314), and at Ancyra (314) and Neo-Cæsarea (*circa* 315) for the Church in Asia Minor. From these it was a natural step to the first General Council at Nicæa in 325. And the decisions of these councils, local and general, were embodied in written enactments or laws, named "canons." The third source is evident before the end of the same century: when the habit arose of referring to the Bishop of Rome for direction or decision, the Pope's answer was given (as the Roman Emperor's was) in the form of a letter, or "decretal," and in time these decretals became as authoritative as the canons of councils, and outnumbered them. The collecting and codifying of canons and decretals—the need for which was bound to arise before long—began at the end of the fifth century; and so little by little the *Jus Antiquum* was built up until it reached its most comprehensive, though still unofficial, exposition in Gratian's *Decretum.*

The law of pre-conquest England was of this sort. British bishops were present at the Council of Arles, and the Church in these islands was bound by the canons of Nicæa and of the later General Councils. Archbishop Theodore, at the Council of Hertford in 673, promulgated ten canons from the *Dionysiana,* or from a collection very much like it. From the days of St. Augustine the Church here was directed by decretal letters, like that sent by Pope Gregory to Augustine in answer to his questions, on payment of the clergy, the variance of customs, thefts of church property, marriage, affinity, consecration of bishops, relations with other bishops, and worthiness to receive the sacraments—a typical list of subjects regulated by canon law. Added to these were the canons of councils, national, provincial, and legatine, and the dooms of witanagemots, assemblies of bishops with the great men of the kingdoms, sitting together under their kings. Only one element came from the West eastward: that was the Penitential

[1] Z. N. Brooke, *The English Church and the Papacy from the Conquest to the Reign of John* (Cambridge, 1931), p. 113.

case-book prescribing remedies for sins, which, from its birthplace, obably in Ireland, spread across England into Gaul, to the con- ion of codifiers coming the other way. Laws from all these sources : collected for English readers in John Johnson's *Canons,* first blished in 1720, and, in their original tongues, in Haddan and abbs's *Councils and Ecclesiastical Documents.*

This period merits careful study, for the Tudor reformers appear have looked back into it to discover what was normative in a tional church, to have looked back, that is to say, for a time when ll sovereignty, ecclesiastical as well as civil, reposed at home. That ms to be the point of the allusion to "divers sundry old authentic tories and chronicles" in the Act in Restraint of Appeals. Their im was that before the papal usurpation the rulers of spiritualty d temporalty within this realm had in themselves ordinary thority, derived from God without papal mediation, to administer re the law of God and of the universal Church, and jurisdiction, nilarly derived, to administer its discipline. We shall return to this im later on. Before the Norman Conquest, however, the Church of gland was passing steadily, with the remainder of the West, under papal dominion: from this time onward the Pope gained in gland undisputed sway, except only in certain points where he was peded, not by the Church or the determinations of either province, t by the king and his lawyers maintaining the customs and statutes the realm. After Lanfranc the English Church had constantly in the most recent of Roman canon law collections, with all the rgeries embodied, and with the notion of the Pope as the fountain- ad of jurisdiction behind them all. The seeking out of these in the thedral and monastic libraries of England was the conclusive hievement of the late Professor Zachary Brooke. Their contents, th an outline of the growth of canonical jurisprudence at this time, adequately described in the third chapter of the *Canon Law eport.* Decretal letters became more numerous, papal legates pre- ded over national councils; appeals to Rome became more frequent, d archbishops found themselves determining as papal delegates uses which had been wrested from them as metropolitans. Between e Conqueror and John, Gregory VII and Innocent III, England s entirely captivated by the novel theory of papal government.

Spiritualty and Temporalty.—In Chapter III of the *Report* is scribed, with admirable clarity, the codification of the *Jus Novum* to the five remaining books which Jean Chapuis edited with the *ecretum* to form the final *Corpus Juris Canonici* in 1500. The first ree of these were official codes, prefaced by papal bulls—the *ecretals* of Gregory IX, published in 1234, and brought into Eng- nd by the cardinal legate Otho three years later; the *Sext* (or *Liber xtus Decretalium*) of Boniface VIII, published in 1298; and the *ementines,* or Constitutions of Clement V put out by his successor, hn XXII, in 1317. The two final collections were the *Extravagantes hannis XXII,* consisting of twenty of that Pope's bulls, and the *xtravagantes Communes,* decretals of various popes between Boni- e VIII and Sixtus IV. These collections, like the *Decretum* of

Gratian, were the unauthorized work of private compilers, though the decretals in them were quoted as law because they emanated from the Pope; they have their place in Lyndwood.

The law contained in these books was promulgated by English archbishops and bishops in their provincial and diocesan synods. The method is very simple: a legate coming into England, as Otho came in 1237 and Ottobon in 1268, or an archbishop visiting his province or a bishop his diocese, learns what are the most pressing needs of that place and time.[1] Then, in his appropriate synod—legatine, provincial, or diocesan—he promulgates as constitutions laws drawn from the *Ius Commune,* the Common Law of the Church, selected to meet those needs. In subsequent visitations these constitutions form the basis of inquiry and injunction, and in any action which may ensue in the ecclesiastical courts they can be tested by reference back again to the Common Law. So, for instance, Bishop Peter Quivil of Exeter promulgated fifty-five constitutions in his diocesan synod held in 1287;[2] they form a most adequate summary of the teaching and laws of the Church as a parish priest would require to know them, as useful as the manuals, the *Pupilla Oculi,* the *Pars Oculi,* and Myrc's rhymed *Instructions for Parish Priests,* which became so popular during the next century. Every parish church was to be provided with a copy of the constitutions, called the Synodus, and in later visitations a question was asked about its condition. Quivil's successors, furthermore, refer to it constantly in their diocesan administration; throughout their registers occur such phrases as *iuxta Constitutiones Synodales nostrarum Civitatis et Diocesis per Dominum Petrum Episcopum editos.*

What Quivil gave to his West-Country diocese, William Lyndwood gave, in a much more thorough, lawyer-like form, to the Province of Canterbury in 1430: in his *Provinciale* he collected the constitutions promulgated in the province by successive archbishops from Stephen Langton to Henry Chichele, whose Official-Principal he was. In the gloss, which is far more extensive than the text of the constitutions, he referred every clause to its source in the decretals or canons as found in the law books of the Church; he quoted the opinions of canonists in explanation; and he indicated with precision every particular in which local custom was at variance with the general custom of the Church. The *Provinciale,* though yet another unofficial compilation, was adopted into the Province of York in 1462, and has become our chief authority for the pre-Reformation canon law of the Church of England.

We said above that the method is very simple: that was an interim statement, to be referred only to the system as it would have worked if the canonists had had all their own way. But they had not: the spiritualty was too closely knit with the temporalty, and the tempor-

[1] The visitation was not the only source of information, but the prescriptive one; English prelates may have learned far more from the petitions presented in Parliament.

[2] Wilkins, *Concilia,* ii, 129-168.

too conscious of its own identity and power, for the spiritual men to execute their laws unhindered by the temporal men. The English bishops were set between two masters, neither of whom could be, if needed, openly despised. At best their relations were adjusted by balance, fiction, or compromise. When the pope believed that his authority, in theory, was absolute and universal, but knew when it was wiser not to press his claims; when the king was obliged, in theory, to maintain his regality against the pope, yet knew well the convenience of securing papal provision to translate his bishops and papal confirmation for other his political acts; when churchmen confessed, in theory, obedience to the pope as to the Vicar of Christ, but were glad of the king's protection against his more inconvenient demands; then contradiction admitted of adjustment, and life was tolerable so long as no one thought too deeply, and Christ's silly sheep at whose expense the game was played could be ignored. But the inevitable tension between two laws administered in one realm—by a series of courts, two systems of jurisprudence, in fact, two sovereignties operative within one sovereign state—was bound to rupture at some time. At the Reformation thinkers espoused the cause of claims, and the rupture began.

Christopher St German.—On the Continent the canonist's traditional opponent was the civilian. But England has never received the Roman civil law; it fell to the common lawyer, therefore, to withstand him here. It is true that in the sixteenth century the civilians of England reached the zenith of their power, and that the Tudor monarchs found high employment for them. But many were doctors of canon law as well, and were bound in closely with the ecclesiastical system, on its bench and in its courts; though they kept themselves free enough, some of them, to reap the profits of its fall. The cause of the common law, and of the divided conscience, was pleaded by Christopher St German, a barrister of the Inner Temple whose influence is as difficult to estimate as his history is to trace. Professor Pollard has summarized most that is known of him in the *Dictionary of National Biography*. He lived from about 1460 to 1540. John Bale extols his learning in both canon and civil law as well as in the common law, and in philosophy and the other liberal sciences. He says it was his custom to read and expound a chapter of Holy Scripture almost every night.[1] His writings were noticed by the Government, and would have found him employment had he wanted it: in July, 1534, Dr Thirlby, then one of Henry's chaplains, writes to Cromwell:

"By the king's command we have met sundry times at the Blackfriars, London, to debate such matters as you proposed to us, but cannot set them forth without the help of men learned in the laws of God and of the realm. We have required several times the assistance of Master Sayntegerman, but he has excused himself. We therefore wait for your further pleasure."[2]

[1] *Index Britanniæ Scriptorum*, ed. R. L. Poole, Oxford, 1902, pp. 53 *f.*; *cf.* Preface to the 1604 ed. of the Latin *Dialogus*, T. Wight.

[2] Let. and Pap. Henry VIII, vii, No. 1008.

It would be interesting to know what Archdeacon Thirlby and hi colleagues were up to, at work upon "the laws of God (*i.e.*, the canon law) and of the realm." The conservatives, too, paid St German the compliment of condemnation: the manifesto of the Pilgrimage o Grace demanded the proscription of his works, with those of Luther Wyclif, Hus, Melanchthon, Bucer, "and such other heresies of Ana baptist";[1] he was, then, distinguished enough to deserve our notice He shows himself a disciple of Gerson, the champion of Gallicanism and the conciliar theory, whom he quotes frequently.

What, then, has St German to say of the canon law in England First, there is something to be learned from the catalogue of hi works. His *Dialogus de fundamentis legum Angliæ et de conscientiæ* was printed by Rastell in 1528, and an English version of the same known traditionally as *Doctor and Student* (it is by no means a translation, nor even a very close version) by Wyer in 1530. The English version was reprinted "with newe addycyons" in 1531. The *Additions* contain *Thirteen Chapters on the Power and Jurisdiction of the Parliament &c.*[2] A *Second Dialogue* appeared in 1530, and was reprinted twice in 1531. Pollard and Redgrave list fifteen more editions of the Dialogues between 1532 and 1638, as well as *An Exact Abridgement* in 1630. I shall comment on this below. His next treatise, *Concernynge the division betwene the spiritualtie and temporaltie,* 1532, drew a witty reply from Sir Thomas More. To More's *Apology,* 1533, in which St German is called Sir John Somesay and The Pacifier, he replied in *Salem and Bizance* in the same year, with "addicions" in 1534. In 1535 (?) he produced *A treatyse concerning the power of the clergye and the lawes of the Realme,* and, if it is his as I believe, *A treatise concernynge divers of the Constitucyons provinciall and legatines (of Otho and Octobone).* Now two significant points emerge. The first is that St German's works appeared in two groups, one immediately preceding the Supplication against the Ordinaries, the Submission of the Clergy and the Act in Restraint of Appeals (1532-34)—when the jurisdiction of the pope and the power to frame and promulgate provincial constitutions without the king's licence were both swept away—and the other in 1535, at the very time when a royal Injunction caused the study of the canon law in the Universities to be suppressed. In each case the agitation bears a likeness to the act. The second point is that the *Dialogues* were exercising an influence, especially among the lawyers by whom they were chiefly read, throughout this critical century, from 1530 to 1640, the year of the decisive rupture with Parliament over the Laudian Canons. They sustained a reasoned protest, on constitutional grounds, against an ecclesiastical jurisdiction in its very being provocative, in its state of corruption hated everywhere. Marsilius of Padua, whose *Defensor Pacis* Marshall published in an English translation in May, 1535, has been recognized as an influence on the

[1] Let. and Pap. Henry VIII, xi, No. 1246.

[2] From the edition of 1761, where the *Additions* are said to be to the *Second Dialogue.*

lish Reformation;[1] to Christopher St German, I suggest, a like ntion should be paid.[2]

German's method is to reduce each contradiction between the mon and the canon laws to a case of conscience which the victim ld have to decide, knowing that he put himself in danger either , of the temporal courts if he offended against statute or custom ne realm, of the spiritual court and excommunication if he defied canon. His only protection lay in a prohibition from one of the g's courts to the spiritual court, claiming the hearing as a tem- l cause. So he traverses, in this dialogue between his Doctor of inity and his Student in the Laws of England, all the familiar nd—patronage, the rights and times of presentation, the abbot e in law without his chapter, the legitimation of children by equent marriage, papal provisions, the tithing of great wood, ht of clergy, and so on through the whole weary round. More ortant for us are the doctrines he deduces from his cases. One of chapter headings in the *Constitutions Provincial and Legatine* ts his fundamental proposition:

"That it is troublous to the people to have two powers within the realm, ceby they may be sued of one thing in several courts and by several orities."

e judges of one tradition cannot understand the other; the laws in different tongues, are learned in different places, are adminis- d with different procedure in different courts; if only the common were codified like the civil the spiritual judges might be com- ed to learn it, but it is not, and it cannot be so learnt.[3]

Within the canon law itself he distinguishes between canons based the law of God, natural and revealed, and those which are but laws of the Church. In tithe-paying, for instance, the obligation emporal men to give to the support of spiritual men is a law of i: the obligation to give an arithmetical tenth is a law of the rch, therefore mutable, and, furthermore, only admitted as a om in this realm by the sufferance of the temporal power, and so n to regulation by the temporal power.[4] By openly defying the om of the realm, as in the case of *Sylva Cædua*, the tithing of at wood," or trees for timber, the canonists

. law against custom, and power against power, and in a manner the tualty against the temporalty, whereby they might know that great vari- and suit would follow. . . . They did not follow the direct order of rity therein so perfectly as they might have done."

y have merely threatened and excommunicated those who yed the law of the realm, and have done nothing to ease con-

---

Let. and Pap. Henry VIII, viii, Nos. 217, 218, 579, 1156; *cf.* N. Sykes, *Crisis of the Reformation* (1946), p. 15.

Cf. J. W. Allen, *Political Thought in the Sixteenth Century* (1928), 165-168, a not too sympathetic account. I owe my interest in St German to Mr Eric np, Fellow and Chaplain of Exeter College, Oxford.

Second Dialogue, c. xxv, ed. of 1761, pp. 188-9.

Ibid., pp. 248 *ff.*

science of its burden. He suggests a remedy: in *The Power of the Clergy and the Laws of the Realm* he answers a question, c. vii, q. 4, "of what effecte the exposycion of master Lynwode upon the (prouyncyal) constitutions is of": as divers of them and of the legatines of Otho and Ottobon are against the king's law and his prerogative, then Lyndwood's exposition must be so too,

"for upon a feble foundacyon can nat be sette a stable buylding."

Therefore these should

"clerely be prohybit and rased out of the bokes so that the yonge men that shall hereafter sette themselfe to studye the canons shal nat be disceyved therby hereafter as manye haue ben in tyme paste."

This treatise was written probably in 1535, the year of the suppression of the study of canon law.

In the *Additions* he develops his exposition of the powers of the king in his parliament as against the spiritualty. The argument is as closely related as before to cases of contention—sanctuaries, mortuary dues, clerical rights and immunities, and so on—and it is as difficult to summarize. He allows to the pope and the spiritual men their authority to determine spiritual principles; but where those principles are to be embodied in customs, and to touch the king's subjects and his lands, there parliament has a competence to regulate, to change, and to abolish. A schism in the papacy threatens the realm with schism: therefore the king and parliament have power by statute to determine which claimant shall be accounted pope within the realm. Why, then, when schisms are arising daily within the realm on account of heresies, diversities of sects and opinions, may not they set a like remedy—not in the detested way of putting suspects to answer before ordinaries on oath,

"but charitably to examine the truth therein, and thereupon by their wisdoms to devise some charitable way for unity and peace."

"And I think verily, that if the king's grace and his parliament, look not upon these matters, it will be hard to tell who shall be able to do it."[1]

The lords and masters spiritual might do it if they would; but while their only care is for

"straight correction and punishments, without finding some provision, that the minds of the people may be somewhat eased,"

there is little hope of good to be had from them.

Parliament has often legislated in time past upon Church affairs, thereby assisting the ordinaries to carry out their canons; and there are many reforms which parliament might properly enact now,

"for the good order of all the people, as well spiritual as temporal, though it judge not upon the right of the things that be mere spiritual."

[1] He enlarges on the bitterness caused by the process *ex officio mero* (i which the ordinary obliged one accused of heresy to answer directly on oat to questions put on the evidence of witnesses whose names were not divulged in the *Division*, c. vii; *cf.* the *Supplication against the Ordinaries*, c. xii. Bot date from 1532.

: he would have them proceed, not by way of imposition, but with sent.

"And all these diversities, and many other more than I can rehearse now, that be learned in the laws of the realm be especially bounden to know, they may instruct the parliament *when the need shall require*, what they lawfully do concerning the spiritual jurisdiction and what not. And there- spiritual men are charitably bound to hear their opinions therein, and t they think be immediately grounded upon the law of God, or upon the of reason, or what not. *For commonly the parliament hath over these laws direct power, but to strengthen them, and to make them to be more surely t it hath good power.*"

on he proposes a joint commission—the one which rises Banquo- at intervals for the next hundred years:

And if spiritual men, and temporal men, would charitably lay their heads ther, and fully determine what the parliament may do, as well concerning spiritual jurisdiction as the temporal, taking these *Additions* as little title- , whereby they by their wisdom may call to their remembrance greater gs, as that hereafter it shall not stand in the case as it doth now, that n parliament hath made a law concerning the spiritualty, that spiritual shall not say, it bindeth not in conscience, as many have done in the past, yet do to this day: I think verily that there would nothing do more good appease such variances, schisms, and divisions, as be now abroad in the m."[1]

would nothing innovate: he would but see restored to the tem- alty its own authority. In *The Power of the Clergy and the ts of the Realm* he writes thus of the late Act of Supremacy, 1534:

"And if the said textes be wel understande it will appere therby . . . that kynges grace hathe no newe auctorite by that he is confessed by the clergy auctorysed by the parlyment to be head of the churche of Englande. For only a declaracyon of his fyrst power comytted to the kynglye and regall torite and no new graunte. And that for all the power that he is the heed of churche, that yet hath none auctorite to minister any of the sacraments ne do any other thyng spirituall, wherof oure lorde gave power only to his stles and discyples. . . . It is no dout but that such power as the clergy h by the immediate graunte of Christ the kyng ne in his parlyment can nat it from theym, thoughe they maye order the manner of the doynge."[2]

The "said textes" of this quotation are the familiar proof texts m the Old and New Testaments, used throughout the Middle Ages justify the supremacy of the spiritual jurisdiction, with its source the papacy. He takes them one by one—a wearisome round— troys the false interpretation, and expounds what the Church was rning to regard as the true. Upon "shew it to the church"—"which ne take to mean 'shew it to the clergy' "—he writes:

Additions, c. x. Italics mine. The work appeared in 1531; in 1532 the Con- ation agreed to the appointment of a royal commission of thirty-two, "six- n to be from the upper and nether house of the temporalty, and other six- n of the clergy." This was embodied in statute, 25 Henry VIII, c. 19; as as 1641, in a bill twice read in the Lords, an attempt was made to set up commission, now to be of sixteen only, because it had never done its work. R. Gardiner, *Select Documents of the Puritan Revolution* (1899), p. 179.)

Op. cit., c. xvii; q. 14, c. xix.

"To that it may be answered that by that worde chyrche is nat understande only the clergye, for they undoubtedly make nat the chyrche, for the hole congregation of Christen people maketh the chyrche."[1]

Now this is all sound doctrine for a national church: it is solid ground on which establishment may rest. It is not Erastian: it assures the spiritual men full authority for their spiritual administrations; it sets parliament and prince under the Divine Law, of which indeed they are ministers. Only it will not suffer the Church to trouble the realm with discordant laws, nor to import the sovereignty of a foreign earthly power. Within one realm, one Church, one sovereignty, one law—that I take to be the conception justifying the repudiation of the papacy and the resolve to revise the canon law and an entirely religious conception it is. But not much insight is needed to see how far we have departed from it now. There is no longer one Church, in any constitutional form the law could recognize. The parliament in which the Sovereign acts is no longer the assembly of churchmen St German saw. And when statute law is at variance with God's law revealed—*e.g.*, upon divorce and remarriage—"one law" is impossible if the Church is to maintain her witness. This departure from Tudor theory has been recognized: the National Assembly (with a House of Communicant Laity) has replaced the Houses of Parliament as the normal organ of Church legislation, though the parliamentary scrutiny of measures before they receive the royal assent is the safeguard against discordant ecclesiastical laws. Logically the Convocations should recognize it too: for—summoned as they are with the sessions of parliament by authority of the King's writ, and promulgating canons only with the King's licence—their legislative procedure is not the pure canonical action of a synod of the church; it is that, merged into the constitutional action of an estate of the realm, as of a body politic in which the Church and the realm are one. Men in the sixteenth century spoke of "spiritualty and temporalty": we in the twentieth speak of "Church and State," and there the difference of the ages lies. By keeping legislating Convocations with a legislating Church Assembly we try to live in both ages at once, and it is a pertinent question whether our energies and our substance could be more economically employed. The Committee of 1913 which "created" the Assembly expected that their work would sooner or later "bring into disuse the old legislative procedure of the Convocations."[2] And, indeed, it should; for if, as our formularies testify, "the hole congregation of Christen people maketh the

[1] *Power of the Clergy*, c. lx, q. 6. Professor Allen (*op. cit.*, p. 167) quotes an opinion of St German's that "Convocation representeth only the state of the clergy," whereas the King in Parliament represents "the whole Catholic Church of England." But he gives no references, and I have not found the statement. Nor does he say by what authority he attributes *An Answere to a Letter* to St German, though he uses it much.

[2] *Report of the Archbishop's Committee on Church and State* (1916), pp. 56. The whole paragraph is pertinent and should be read. *Cf. The Church Assembly and the Church: A Book of Essays* (1930), p. 228, for a criticism of the attempt to work both systems in practice.

:che," and not the clergy only, then a synod representing the whole istian people, and not the clergy only, should make the Church's s. But the Canon Law Commission expects no such change: the ed Synods, by which are meant the Convocations sitting pro- ially or together, are "the true Church of England by Represen- on" (Canon CXXVI); what the National Assembly of the Church England is, then, is left unspecified; only by a negation is its tion to the Convocations defined—it "does not, and shall not, inish or derogate" from any of their powers (Canon CXXXIV). e is an apparent anomaly which the Church, when it enacts new ons, ought either to justify or to remove.

G. R. Dunstan.

(*To be concluded.*)

MISPRINTS IN THE REPORT

9-10. For *Hatfield* read *Hertford*, three times, And to the reference to Haddan and Stubbs should be added *p. 443*.

49, n. 7. For *p. 95* read *p. 56*.

75, l. 4. For *at the end of Canon CXIII* read *in Canon CXII*.

5. Is this evidence of a last-minute revision of these two canons? Their present state of confusion will be commented on in the second of these articles.

109, l. 1. For *allot her* read *all other*.

123, *ad* Can. XXXI, §2. In the annotation, for *Canon 28* read *Canon 29*.

The Archbishop and Reunion

The Archbishop of Canterbury's sermon preached before the Uni- sity of Cambridge on Sunday, November 3rd, 1946, was a rageous and well-timed attempt to give a new impulse to the cause the reunion of the Church in this country. Despite the great pro- ss in co-operation and mutual understanding made by the rches over the last generation, a certain sense of frustration and k of clarity about what the next step should be has been widely recently, and the Archbishop's action should achieve its purpose helping the churches to make a new beginning.

The Archbishop was anxious to make clear that he was doing no re than attempting to restart discussion on a new basis, and it is portant that what he suggested should be considered in that way. s suggestion that the aim at present should not be corporate re- on but full communion between the Church of England, the urch of Scotland, and the English Free Churches, with a ministry tually acknowledged by all as possessing not only the inward call the Spirit but also the authority which each church in conscience uires, was intended as a starting-point for conversation rather n a concrete proposal which demands a decision. That conversa- n implies the examination of the implications of the suggestion. is will, no doubt, be done by the official committees which have

begun to meet at Lambeth, but it is important that there should be as much public discussion of the matter as possible, and these notes are offered as a contribution to that discussion.

It must be said at the outset that what the Archbishop suggests has one outstanding merit. It represents a break with the notion that either we must aim immediately at complete organic union or else at nothing at all. This idea, which, as an unexamined assumption, has had a great influence upon reunion discussion in the past, has done much to produce the feeling of frustration which has already been mentioned. Apart from anything else, the legal and constitutional complexities involved in even the simplest act of merging ecclesiastical organizations are such that they would effectively distract the churches concerned from facing the numerous other urgent questions which demand their attention in this age. It stands to reason that reunion is likely to come more speedily if the churches, having a clear policy in relation to each other, proceed step by step from one limited objective to the next, steadily growing together in the process, rather than that they should continue hoping wistfully that a sudden miraculous transformation will take place which will overcome all their difficulties.

Some Unexamined Assumptions.—The Archbishop is wise, therefore, in suggesting something a good deal less than corporate reunion at present. When we stop to consider what is involved in "full communion" at this stage, however, the question remains as to whether he is still not suggesting far too much. This is not said from the viewpoint of one particular party or denomination, but on the basis of an analysis of what is likely to be possible among the churches as they are at present and are likely to be in the immediate future. The Archbishop has done us the service of exposing one false assumption upon which a great many ineffectual attempts to achieve reunion have been based. Are there any other assumptions which demand further examination?

It is frequently assumed that a decisive majority in all the churches involved in the discussion honestly believe division to be a sin, are intensely dissatisfied with their present state, and ardently long for reunion. Yet it is clear that the truth is very different. There are many in all the churches who do not desire reunion, either through an apathetic contentment with things as they are or else through social prejudice. There are not a few in all the churches, and many in some, who do not desire it through theological conviction. It is true that a popular feeling exists, both within and outside the churches, that reunion is a good thing; but it often has little roots in either understanding or experience, and it is doubtful whether it would be prepared for the radical readjustment of outlook which reunion would involve. The Œcumenical Movement is, in point of fact, a minority movement in all the churches. To act on the assumption that churches are prepared to back up even what their accredited representatives at inter-church conferences agree to is to be deluded. There are few matters upon which the gap between leaders and rank and file is wider than this. In suggesting so bold a step as full com

nion between all the churches at this stage the Archbishop lays nself open to the suspicion of being unduly influenced by this umption. He speaks with great authority, but he cannot be sur- sed if Free Churchmen and members of the Church of Scotland, ose experience of the attitude of members of his church in many ces is very different from their experience of the attitude of the chbishop, wonder how far he really carries his church with him.

The Archbishop explicitly makes another assumption. He states at on the theology of Redemption and Grace, on the Scriptures, Creeds, and the Sacraments, no fundamental divisions exist ween the churches and that it is only around the doctrine of the nistry that difficulties gather. But surely the matter is not as simple that. It may be agreed that on all points except those of church ier the differences between the classic formularies of the churches ncerned are of minor importance; but the relations of all the urches to those formularies at present are very difficult to define, d when we consider the theological viewpoints which have to be ken into account when we are trying to reach agreement in the urches at present the assumption is seen to be very partially true deed. Would an orthodox Methodist and an Anglican Modernist ree about the doctrine of redemption? Would a Presbyterian and Anglo-Catholic agree about the doctrine of grace? Would a Con- egational Liberal agree with a Fundamentalist Baptist or an Anglo- tholic or an orthodox Reformed Protestant about the interpreta- n of Scripture? Have the Church of England and the Baptists ched any kind of understanding about infant baptism?

It is sometimes argued that although this may be the case, eological divisions are no longer co-terminous with ecclesiastical visions. That is true, but it is hard to see why this should be held prove the further point that therefore the work of reunion is made sier. Such a situation creates difficulties and strains on loyalty far eater than those previously known. A church which is at unity ithin herself is in a position to formulate a policy towards other urches. A church radically divided cannot have such a policy, for y attempt to frame one serves only to bring out the divisions, and en when her leaders attempt to give a lead they can rarely have nfidence that it will be followed. Those who are finding, across nominational barriers, that they share a common approach to their derstanding of the Gospel and of the Church and of the Church's sk in society are drawing closer together, and it is right that they ould do so. This fact is, ultimately, the most hopeful of all in the esent situation, and with it our constructive policy must begin. ut its immediate consequence is to create new problems, for it akes the relationship of those who discover this unity with their nominational colleagues who do not highly equivocal. It may be at a new alignment of ecclesiastical forces is on the way; but if it is s form is not yet clear, and in the meantime the fact that no nomination can be sure of where it stands seriously inhibits any nited action.

This means, unfortunately, that the Archbishop will probably be

proved to be too hopeful in suggesting full communion between the Church of England, the Church of Scotland, and the Free Churches. There are many individual ministers and some individual churches who are ready for it and who will welcome it, but it is hard to see how it is workable as a comprehensive scheme at present. What is likely to be the attitude of a Baptist church of a fairly common type, one of strong evangelical conviction and little intellectual breadth, to a proposal that it should be in full communion with an Anglo-Catholic church in its neighbourhood, which apes the Church of Rome in all things and affects not to notice the existence of Non-conformists? Or, for that matter, is an Anglican of even the most moderately "strong" churchmanship likely to find it easy to be in full communion with the type of Congregational church which is to be found here and there, where there has been no regular minister for years and the pulpit is supplied by a succession of lay preachers who administer the sacraments according to an impressionistic method of their own and where control is firmly in the hands of a little clique who steadfastly ignore the advice offered them by the Moderator, who has no power to act against them? Canon Demant has said that the Church is divided because she is weak, not weak because she is divided. While such striking evidences of weakness exist in her, can she hope for any concerted action? A good case could be made out for the position that division itself is such a grave form of disorder that the lumping of all churches together in a much closer set of relationships, even if it involved condoning occasional irregularities like those just mentioned, would create a much less disorderly situation than that which exists at present. But would the dissentient churches consent to be lumped together?

Constructive Tasks. — Although full communion between the churches concerned may be too much to hope for in the immediate future, that is not to say that there is nothing to do but to sit back and wait for better times. Many solidly constructive tasks await us, tasks whose fulfilment will both demand all the resources which are available and greatly advance the cause of reunion.

First, serious conversations according to a definite plan about the chief theological issues which are outstanding between the churches must be reopened. It is true that, as the Archbishop reminds us, we cannot afford to wait until the theologians have reached agreement before embarking upon any action, but the theologians, even while they continue to disagree, can do much to help us define the nature of the action to be undertaken. At the same time, the theologians themselves should set about to do far more than they have hitherto done to resolve the long-standing differences between the churches. A considerable theological literature has appeared about the problems of reunion on a world scale, but how much has appeared on the distinctive issues which divide the churches here in England? A fair number of reports of commissions appointed by various churches to discuss their doctrinal position with reference to other churches have appeared, but how effective and sustained has been the interchange between them? What is needed is not the light skirmishing over

ese matters which is indulged in at short occasional conferences or joint fraternal meetings, but their systematic study by groups of eologians who work together over them for a long period and who, they reach a new agreement, do their utmost to compel their urches to make decisions on the basis of such agreement. The icial groups of theologians appointed by the churches to discuss estions of Faith and Order have had many difficulties to contend th in recent years, but it is hard to see how much real progress wards union can be made while they make little effort to frame or plement a policy and to mobilize the theological resources of the urches for attempting to resolve the disagreements which have parated them for so long. We cannot wait upon the theologians fore doing anything, and many of the greatest barriers to reunion e not of a theological character; but there can ultimately be no union until the theological differences are settled. When, in cent times, has a representative group of theologians really got to ips with the question of baptism? Yet it is hard to see how the eat Baptist denomination is ever likely to join in a scheme unless receives satisfaction in this matter. We are told that it is in relation the ministry that most difficulty exists at present. Has a systematic ort on anything like the scale necessary ever been made by the urches to try to reach agreement on this matter? If the theologians pect to be heard upon these questions, they must take their re- onsibilities more seriously. When the effort is made, with the deter- ination not to break off conversation when it becomes difficult, we elieve that the outlines of new and fundamental agreement on many atters, and not least those of baptism and the ministry, will emerge. should be added that conversations between theologians within e divided denominations themselves need also to go on simul- neously.

Secondly, a policy of responsible co-operation between the de- minations in local situations, which accepts frankly their divisions ut aims to achieve the maximum of co-operation possible without rrender of principle, needs to be worked out. It will be a policy for cal situations, but it is essential that it be accepted by the denomi- tions as a national policy and that their local and regional officials committed to implement it as far as possible. A considerable easure of co-operation in evangelism and visitation and social itness and joint worship has been achieved in some neighbour- oods by like-minded clergy and congregations, but conditions vary normously from one town to another, and even when relations are ood they often depend on individual friendships between particular inisters and clergy who happen to be working together for a short me. Also, the terms on which co-operation is offered are frequently undefined that persons of strong conviction hesitate to come in ecause they fear that they may be involved in more than they had argained for. If a national policy of local co-operation similar to hat substantially achieved on the national level were worked out, nd if it were backed up by careful and experienced advice about ow to avoid the familiar pitfalls, it would not work miracles nor

would it carry the determined dissentients, but it would help to prick the consciences of the indifferent, encourage the hesitant, and curb the undiscriminatingly enthusiastic. It would also create a setting in which the churches could be given the opportunity of growing closer together and thus preparing the ground for bolder and more ambitious policies in the future. Such a policy, on the basis of existing experience, could be worked out quickly with no great difficulty.

Thirdly, a much closer relationship between those in the churches who do share a common approach should be worked out. This might be done along two lines. In the first place, particular experiments in co-operation of a much fuller and bolder character than any yet known might be initiated. The proposed Christian Centre at Coventry points the way for one type of experiment. Such centres could profitably be set up in most of the larger English cities, although, if they were, the question of how the specialist staffs they would require were to be trained and recruited should be given priority over all else. But experiments in the linking together of particular congregations might also be attempted. For example, an Anglican and a Free Church minister who know each other very well and who have achieved a common conviction about the nature of the Gospel, the Church, the Church's task in society, and, not least in importance, the distinctive vocations of their denominations in relation to one another in modern England, might go together into a new suburb or a new town or to start a new piece of work in the centre of a large city. There they might from the outset build up their congregations as members of one Christian community, still divided on some vital matters, but in genuine "full communion" with one another because they lived together as Christians. Such an arrangement could only work where there was real understanding between the ministers concerned, but the churches could do much to encourage such experiments by removing any administrative or legal difficulties which might be in the way.

The other line of possible development must be much more tentative. The difficulties in the way of a universal scheme of mutual recognition of ministries at present are formidable. Are they so great in the case of those ministers who do have a great deal in common and who do passionately desire on the ground of theological conviction to be at one in ministry with their brethren of other churches? Is the suggestion worth considering that a group should be called together who would frame a new statement of faith, which would be the basis upon which ministers and possibly congregations would enter into covenant with one another to enjoy full communion? It is not implied that such a procedure might not create serious difficulties for those concerned, difficulties which might very well prove insuperable. In particular, the relation of such a "Confessional Church" to the existing denominations would need the most careful scrutiny. But we do submit that at least as a basis for discussion it is both more realistic and more hopeful than the Archbishop's suggestion of universal full communion.

Another Assumption.—We have spoken about false assumptions

at have vitiated the work of the Œcumenical Movement in this untry. There is another which is very commonly held and which is e most erroneous of all. It is that because reunion is such a nice a it will be invoked into existence by our constantly expressing proval of it instead of by hard work, self-sacrifice, and perseverance. ne fundamental reason why reunion has not yet come in this untry is that too few people have put enough energy and thought d care into bringing it about. The churches want to be concerned out reunion, just as they want effective Christian action in society, not at the cost of painful readjustment in their thinking and ner of life. These are marginal activities in the Church, matters be "interested in" rather than to be concerned about in a manner ich might lead one day to important practical decisions. No re- ion which purifies and renews and heals the Body of Christ will ne while we retain that attitude. The Church in England to-day perately needs reunion, both for her own sake and if she is ever to g the common life of England back into Christian allegiance. In gland at least, where the churches are so much more involved with e another and with the general life of the nation than anywhere e, it is the truth that no church can reform itself without taking o itself the best of other traditions. Our church life and our ional life have long been grievously impoverished because of our isions, and the only effective way to save ourselves from a debased ational Christianity" is not to retreat still further into our de- minational shells, but to draw closer together in a common concern the renewal of the Church and the common life through a newed apprehension of the sovereign power of God in Christ. But d will not grant us this gift if all we do is to reiterate how valuable consider it to be, while we remain firmly embedded in the old ys. It has been well said that the Œcumenical Movement will not ieve its ends until it inspires a measure of devotion, faith, and -sacrifice comparable to that evoked by the missionary movement its early days. Reunion in England will not be easy. The Church too weak and too set in her divisions for that to be possible. We ast allow for that fact and not be discouraged as difficulties mount, we must press on in the assurance that God wills that we should ss on, if we are to hope for reformation and renewal in this land.

DANIEL JENKINS.

Passion Without Grace

A SERMON PREACHED ON GOOD FRIDAY, 1947, IN THE MARKUS-KIRCHE AT STUTTGART

Woe unto the world because of Offences! for it must needs be that ences come; but woe to that man by whom the Offence cometh!—tt. xviii, 7.

WHAT would Good Friday be without that word of dereliction, y God, My God, why hast Thou forsaken Me?"—that word so

fearful that the sun lost its brightness, the sun which for so many centuries had had to look down on oceans of blood and rivers of tears, but could not bear to behold this uttermost horror, and so veiled its face. Yet in that Event there lies also the deepest comfort; and out of this the most awful of the words of Jesus there comes to us the great question of Good Friday: How comes it that sorrow can bring comfort?

In the ordinary way, what we observe is the precise opposite. From their ragged condition, out of their ruins, out of their attics and cellars men come to seek an hour or two of joy and distraction. To see the glittering costume of an actor behind the footlights, to enjoy the professional agility with which he brings off his tricks, is to feel that even now in this vale of woe a little glitter and brightness is still possible, and the appalling severity of life will still allow sometimes of an innocent game. To see on the films normally behaving people in well-furnished rooms, or at the theatre rococo pastoral idylls, can help men, perhaps by the very contrast with their present misery, to find their feet for a short while in dreams which are utterly belied by the sheer brutality of real life.

But on Good Friday we are presented with that most un-idyllic of all sights, that of the Crucifixion. We are there made to think of the multitudes who in our own day have suffered a kind of crucifixion—on the battlefield, in the concentration camps, in cellars cracking in ruin as the bombs fell, in the panic-stricken terror of the underground catastrophes which none remained alive to relate, under the atomic bombs, under the fist of the executioner; the women standing round the cross are represented a hundredfold by women sorrowing and broken-hearted, widows and mothers bereaved. Ought we then to seek to avoid this picture of blood, of dislocated limbs, of despairing survivors? Should we erase it from our minds, and should we rather seek the falsehoods of the rococo than the picture of the truth—which is *our* truth, which oppresses us, and from which we long to get a momentary escape?

Yet what we see to-day is the precise opposite of this: we all to-day are contemplating the Cross; and while the sun hides its face we open our eyes and look on the world with the eyes of our brothers in the prisoner of war camps in Russia, France, Egypt, of those who are in the political internment camps, of the widows and the orphans, and the young people who have had to see far too much already of blood and agony, who are looking on scenes of outrage and suffering. Why is this?

It is because we perceive that *this* Sufferer in the woe of His Cross bears all our woes. It is not good advice that He gives us, or such exhortations as a respectable citizen might administer to some poor refugee, who says to himself meanwhile that no doubt it is all true but it is easy for him to talk, and he knows nothing at all of the vacancy and despair in which I am caught. Jesus is no well-fed burgher; the Cross on which He hangs is planted in the midst of that abyss into which we all have been driven. To Him, therefore, we can all come, with all our guilt and all our torment of conscience—for

is the one who not only takes our griefs into His understanding, receives them into His hands pierced with the nails. We can come our grief for our loved ones—for He too had to leave His her and His friends, with only a glimpse of them, and without opportunity of a last handshake. Most important of all, He ured the sense of abandonment by God; and if you and I no ger see in this madhouse of history and in the chaos of our lives meaning or any room for God, we can tell Him this also, and let eyes rest even on this most secret and dreadful distress of our life. t distress can receive no help from the contemplation of idylls falsehoods; the passion hymn is right which says, "Wounds must ealed by wounds." Only the wounded ones can be true pastors of is, who themselves know the pain of life and the fear of death. us Christ can be our Saviour, because He suffered torment. It ld not be Good Friday without that terrible word, "My God, My l, why hast Thou forsaken Me?"

here is also another side to Good Friday—namely, that Jesus in dereliction did not cry out in self-tormenting defiance and air, through all the spaces of heaven and hell, "Where is God ?" He laid this distress in prayer before His Father in heaven, ressing Him as "Thou," though the vision of His countenance disappeared, and prayed to Him in the hallowed words of the ion psalm. Then, in spite of all, the heavens stood open over His s and wounds. We too, coming to His Cross, can know this most soling fact, that we may stand with Him under the opened vens; our fists that had been clenched in obstinate despair can lench themselves and clasp themselves again in the attitude of yer. Then deliverance has already come, when we no longer have ry out, but can find again the word that liberates us, and can in pray. He has brought us deliverance, who hung on His Cross ve the abyss of our hell and under the opened heavens.

ear people, men have often talked in the past of the "passion of many," and to-day that phrase is heard again. It has been used of e painful epochs in our history when our country has suffered has been on the edge of death. I do not wish to emphasize it , but we do well to avoid this phrase; for what we suffer is our t, but He who was crucified on Calvary had His brethren's sins ear, and not any of His own. In this phrase "the passion of many" there may easily lie a piece of dangerous self-pity, which cheat us of the fruit of genuine penitence.

ut if we may dwell on that phrase for a moment yet, let us ask selves whether it may not be leading us to an "accursed Good lay," a devilish parody of Calvary. It would indeed be a cursed d Friday if we were found indulging in self-pity instead of identi- g ourselves with the passion hymn which says "I and my sins, ch are like grains of corn, like the sand on the seashore." Those brought Him to the Cross; they have also, through my silence as as my complicity, helped to unloose the fearful hellhound which ow raging among the nations, and has unleashed the mad desire retaliation, blind self-will, and godless triumph. Cursed will be

the Good Friday of the "passion of Germany" if we only take offence at the horror of our condition, the ruins, the mass graves, the iron-seeming future, and if we do not find The Word, Him who cries, "My God, My God," if we do not find the Cross, over which the heavens stand open. Cursed would be every Good Friday where there was not *this* Cross; its suffering would lead only to death, to a crash into the abyss of hell, instead of into the Father's hands.

How does it come about that our nation seems to be drifting into this accursed Good Friday, this passion that brings no Grace? It is because it takes offence at its fate, and learns in its distress to pray less and less, and to curse more and more: it curses God, who has abandoned it; it curses the dictator, whom it allowed to lead it and lead it astray; it curses the new holders of power, who rob it of its future and to whose vengeance it sees itself delivered up; it curses all high-flying dreams of renewal; it curses all patient waiting and quietness. This is like the curse that Faust uttered as he came to his end; and Faust's curse is resounding throughout our land. This is the "Offence" that holds the soul in bondage and does not allow this "passion of Germany" to become a blessing; for there can be no blessing in it unless it is being endured near the Cross of our Lord and our Brother, above whom the heavens are open, and under whose feet hell lies vanquished.

But how, then, have we come to this terrible "Offence," which robs us of present comfort and of hope for the future? To-day, on Good Friday, we must find that comfort, lest the night of Golgotha close down upon us and bury us in darkness. "It must needs be that offences come," said our Lord. The offences, the sufferings and calamities, cannot of themselves become blessings and bring us to God. If God be not gracious to us, we shall be overwhelmed by them. Then the end of all is the grimace of fate, and not the countenance of the Father.

The meaning of "offence" (*skandalon*) is, literally, "the bent wooden bar in a trap, which carries the bait, and which, when touched by the animal, springs back and closes the trap." Are we not all thus entrapped in a mysterious way by our rebellious thoughts, our fears, and our despair? So it must be, says Jesus; no one can release himself from the trap. The Passions and Good Fridays which men prepare for themselves know no Easter and no comfort; they know only a cry of dereliction which in this case is the end, the night of despair.

But Jesus adds also, "Woe to that man by whom the Offence cometh." So, then, one man can become to another an Offence, a deadly trap; one can rob another of his eternity, his penitence, his homecoming, his peace with God. What a terrible saying! Are there indeed men who become an Offence to us?

Dear people, I have for long wrestled with God to know what I ought to do; whether I should say publicly on Good Friday what I am going to say. But I must do so, and may God overrule it for good. I will say it as tranquilly as I can.

A man came lately to see me who had come out of a political

ernment camp after terrible experiences there. He said: "The urch speaks publicly of German guilt, and she beats her breast in nitence that she has kept silence too much. I tell you I have no re faith in anything that the Church says, either her confession of lt or her message about Jesus Christ, if she now again keeps silent out the wrong that is being done, and does not stand up openly l bear witness against it, accepting for herself any kind of martyr- m for doing so." I confess that these words have pursued me, and re accused me, and constrained me to obedience, if this man and ny other humiliated sufferers are not to require their souls of me the Last Judgment. Here was a soul caught in the trap of the ence, and in peril of being destroyed by two terrible "scandals": one, the wrong done by the Occupying Powers; the other, our nce about the matter.

et it then be publicly said, in face of the Cross of Calvary on ich the Son of God presented to the Father the pains of all who er distress and offence, that the people who are entrusted to us as hurch are suffering Offence and are being caught in a deadly trap; re is disbelief in Christ, because those who came to us in His me, and spoke of human justice, of democracy, and of a Christian ilization, act unjustly, and thereby make it impossible for us to ieve, not only in them, but also in the Founder of Christianity, in ose Name they claimed to come.

Not long ago I spoke in the Political Internment Camp at Darm- lt, in which more than 10,000 men had to survive the fierce cold his winter almost shelterless, in tents. I could go through it as one o in the midst of desperation of soul, of bodily agony, of wreckage hope, spoke the Gospel of the Saviour and the comfort of the ss. But I should give the lie to that Gospel message if I refused w publicly to plead the cause of those outraged and degraded n, in the Saviour's Name. They are imprisoned there—many of m without right of trial; old and young, guilty and innocent ether—in a way that denies human rights and leads to the ruin souls.

speak as a representative of the Church, and as in sight of the t Judgment, before which we shall all one day stand, all we who e helped to loose the hound of hell by our silence and complicity, l all they who, although they came in the name of Christianity, now letting the hound of hell rage further. It is injustice, it is an ence. Not only the bodies but the souls also of the prisoners are peril of death, and the glimmering lamp of their faith flickers re and more.

think of the many refugees who have died in ice-cold cattle gons on the railway, a more merciless death than that of cattle in ghterhouses. I think of the prisoners of war, many thousands of m permitted to die of hunger by those who came in the name of manity. I ask in the Name of Jesus Christ for the souls of our ng men, who have no longer any faith because it seems to them t there is nothing left to believe in. Then they might believe at st this, that there is a Church of Jesus which takes the part of the

souls entrusted to it and proclaims to the world what is here being done in the name of Christianity and human rights.

I see how in the name of denazification it is not the guilty who are punished or justice helped to prevail, but there is arbitrariness and injustice; the tormented people, in a new outburst of madness and embitterment, invoke the names of their former rulers who now are dead, and begin to ask themselves in a spirit of grim defiance whether they were not right when they foretold nothing but hatred and destruction, and whether they were not after all the true friends of their nation when they called for war to final victory or else annihilation. That which is being done among us in the name of denazification is not only unjust; it is murder of souls and destruction of faith. In consequence of it there are families in despair, with no hope left on earth; more than this, there are men for whom eternity too becomes a gaping emptiness, when faith utterly breaks down. How can this witches' cauldron of madness have anything to do with a heavenly Father?

I think also of the things that are happening in the east of Germany, where inhumanity reigns; of the removal of living men secretly at night, the robbery of the industrial means of livelihood, the removal of machinery, and the abduction of German brains.

Perhaps I should have kept silence about all this if those who do these things, together with their German gaolers, had professed to come in the name of vengeance. Then our youth would now be in a position to see the final consequences of injustice and godlessness, and the terrible law of nemesis and recompense. Then we should have had to bow down in silence before God's dreadful and just chastisement. But they did not say this; they solemnly declared that they came in the spirit of Christianity and humanity. Our late rulers were at least honourable enough not to use as their signboard the picture of the Crucified, but that of the Blond Beast.

As members of the Church of Jesus we must, as some of us at least tried to do even under the Third Reich, stand up both for the picture of our Lord which men have insulted, and for the youth of our nation, whose faith in Christianity is being shattered along with the faith that they once had in the justice of our conquerors. Those who listen to the voices that whisper in secret, or walk by night in the dark streets where men converse unrecognized, know that instead of the denazification which we hoped for, which we all hoped for, we are threatened with renazification on a great scale.

An English newspaperman wrote in the *Neue Zeitung* that of all that he heard on his visit to Germany, what had moved him most was the cry of a young student: "For God's sake do not make us into Nazis!"

Someone had to stand up and proclaim all this aloud, in order that it should not any more be said that the Church has been silent and has thereby made itself an accomplice in the ruin of souls and in the crucifying of Christ afresh. I could do no other; may God help me! Those to whom I sought to speak a word of comfort during the air

r will, I hope, find me not unworthy of trust in this new peril to uls.

Dear people of the Church of the crucified Lord, why do I say all s? It is because I see with growing alarm that the Church is silent out these things and makes no public utterance, even though lividuals, such as our honoured Bishop, constantly break the ence and, like Ekkehardt, protect those who are suffering. I can no nger accept the Church's public confession of sin, in which I myself reservedly join, so long as this other thing is not said publicly, and plainly and relentlessly as befits the speech of disciples of Christ.

Have I said all this in the spirit of an aggrieved nationalism? May od save me from that! In the speech of a pastor of souls no other otive ought to come in than anxiety for the welfare of souls. Or ve I said it in order to suggest that the evils which we suffer go yond what we have deserved? Have I said it to suggest that the served judgments of God upon us are not to be accepted as judg-nts—when millions among us, including old men, women, and ildren, have paid the penalty of their lives, when houses and operty have been reduced to dust, when millions have been chased of their homes, cultivated lands have become a wilderness, when the terror of the air war tens of thousands of defenceless people e been herded together in terror of death, and as in the meadows the Elbe at Dresden have been slaughtered by the fire of a pitiless emy?

I would not open my mouth, dear people, in order to say that all is is too severe, terribly hard though it is. I dare not criticize the dgments of God. We have deserved the penalty of death after all at has been done among us, after what has been done to the people the occupied countries, to the Jews, to the mentally defective, to e Communists and those others who have suffered for their con-tions. If it were my intention, in speaking as I have done of the ilt of our former enemies, to whitewash ourselves and lead our ople to self-justification instead of seeking our pardon at Calvary, at would be as much as to say that we have no need of the shedding His Blood because the sufferings that have come upon us have mpensated for our fault, and our guilt is no greater than that of ose others. All this I do not say. It is not for us men to make mpensation for our sins and take on ourselves God's prerogative of dgment. Before the Cross of Christ we stand as sinners; if He had t hung thereon we should be lost and have no hope.

No; it is as a pastor and teacher in the Church, who in his dination vows has promised to be a shepherd and not a hireling, at I have the duty to speak out publicly and in such a way that hers may hear who perhaps have no one else to bind it on their science; that I may say that what is happening is Offence and the in of souls, that a despairing nation is losing its faith, and a ghtful Nihilism is the fate that hangs over it. Thereby it will be en over defenceless to the horror that threatens it from the East—t to speak of the rest.

Not long ago a friend of mine who is a youth leader asked me to

say a helpful word about the plundering of foodstuffs and coal from trains in the Rhineland. I could not do so. The word that was asked for, though no doubt correct enough, would have stuck in my throat if I, who myself was not in a state of starvation, had set myself to admonish others who, faced with death, stole and robbed on behalf of their brothers and sisters, their children and mothers. But I do accuse those who allowed things to come to this pass, so that our desperate young people lose hold of their last standards of right and wrong, of "mine" and "thine," of obedience and shame. That is ruin of souls!

Perhaps we ourselves share in this guilt of the ruin of souls, souls that Jesus Christ bought with His blood. Multitudes are being ruined in body and soul in this catastrophe of our nation, and we are guilty of it by our silence and complicity. Therefore, in the Name of God and in the Name of Him who died for the souls of these our brothers, let this cursed silence now be broken. Let men do to us what they will. We can but fall into the hands of God; and he who confesses with his mouth shall be saved.

I know of one only in the whole world—but that may be the fault of my defective information—who has raised his voice so that it cannot fail to be heard against this ruin of bodies and souls, and turned his face in love to the hungry and neglected children in our Fatherland, and that is the Englishman, Victor Gollancz—not a Christian, but a Jew. As once a good Samaritan put the Jews to shame, so now a merciful Jew puts to shame the Christians.[1]

So then this Church of Jesus raises its voice, not indeed against those who have been guilty of these things, but on their behalf, for a testimony unto them (Mark vi, 11). For He died for friend and foe alike. When at the end of this sermon we recite the Lord's Prayer together we will not only confess our own trespasses, but also pray for them that trespass against us—for our enemies—and that hate and contempt may have no place in any of the hearts where the Crucified wills to prepare His abode.

How cruel a world this is, in which and for which Jesus died! During this hour we have in some degree entered into the Passion of

[1] Lest I be misunderstood, I add to the text of my sermon this note, that I recognize with great thankfulness the ready helpfulness and brotherly candour of Christians in neutral and ex-enemy countries, which indeed fills us with shame. I remember many chivalrous and brotherly utterances of foreign church leaders. In the œcumenical Christian movement we can feel that we are understood, in the solidarity of forgiven sin. God's goodness has been shown abundantly since the war in the midst of our derangement and chaos of speech. But the duty of watchfulness on behalf of justice and in the name of certain ideals has been taken up by none with such thoroughness of love as by Victor Gollancz. He knows what opportunities the Allies had after their victory over us to show to a disenchanted nation, guilty, and longing for a new foothold, that there still remained in the world a sense of right and loyalty to a pledged word. That this last chance, humanly speaking, which still remained for the inner healing of our nation, was shamefully betrayed is the thing that has opened the gates to a destruction which is all the more horrible and incalculable because it cannot be expressed in the statistics, the election results, and the other tomfoolery in which bureaucratic red-tape delights.

od Friday in the individual soul; and that is better and more tiful than any Good Friday sentimentality. Not for the weeping men who accompanied Him on His way to the Cross, and who ted only the painful pleasure of their nervous agitation, does His omise hold good, but for those who are prepared to die with Him l rise again, who shrink not from the Cross and its shame, and do t fear the hatred of men. Truly this is a cruel world; and Jesus mself says of it that it is subject to the reign of fear.

But now we are solemnly assured that Jesus has overcome this rible world, and that it can hurt us no more. It is said to us quite ply that "He is our Peace." Understand clearly: it is not said t He brings peace between the nations, or causes horror and strife come to an end. What is said is that HE IS our Peace, that fellow-p with the Father exists as a fact, and that we may rest in this ce, in the midst of the frightful strife of men. Where else in the rld can there be peace? How can men seek to establish peace in world who do not know in themselves this Peace with God? w can order be set up in the world when men are not in order h God?

Therefore the Church of God stands sober and realistic in the dst of the despairing and even frantic efforts of a fallen world to tore the lost peace. So she can be, in the midst of a world in which re will always be war and the noises of war, because she knows place of hidden security, and knows that the Cross of God's Peace nds royally planted in this vale of sorrow, and that the horizon ws with the rays of a dawning Day. In that Day God will be all in ; the Man of Sorrows will come, with His sickle and with His wn and sceptre, and will summon enemies and friends, mockers th disciples, before His throne. With trembling and with joy we ait His Advent, because we have the Cross and with it His Peace; th His Peace is the only peace which will never betray us, either in s world or in that which is to come.

We stand as heralds of the coming King in this world of Offences d perils and wild weather. We stand in the shelter of the Cross and l praise God, even if we are crucified for doing so. We look up to light of heaven which gleams above us, and which has already gun to glow on the horizon, and we ardently pray, "Come, Lord us."

The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you all. Amen.

"I have set watchmen upon thy walls, O Jerusalem, which shall ver hold their peace day nor night. Ye that make mention of the rd, keep not silence."—Isa. lxii, 6.

H. THIELICKE.

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

The Rev. G. R. Dunstan is Sub-Warden of St Deiniol's Library, warden.

The Rev. Daniel Jenkins is on the staff of the Christian Frontier.

He is the author of *The Nature of Catholicity, The Gift of Ministry*, etc.

Professor Thielicke, of Tübingen, is evidently a great name in Germany, and his Good Friday sermon has become famous. It is obvious that at certain points he is altogether unfair to the Americans and to ourselves, and makes no allowances for the gigantic difficulties with which the Allied administration has had to contend; and no doubt his sermon would have gained in impressiveness if he had been fairer in his judgments. But the sermon is to be read as a document coming out of contemporary Germany, and throwing a light such as perhaps no other document throws on the spiritual plight of the nation. The allusion to Victor Gollancz is, of course, to his book *In Darkest Germany*.

Fr Richard Johnson and Fr Gabriel Hebert, S.S.M., are responsible for the translation; they have had the help of an able German friend, who has approved of the translation as a true rendering in English of what Professor Thielicke is saying in German. But it is, especially in the introductory part, a somewhat free translation; indeed, it would be a task of immense difficulty to produce a literal translation which was readable and intelligible in another language.

CORRESPONDENCE

THE S.P.G. AND SOUTH INDIA

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

SIR,

The decision to withdraw all grants from the four dioceses which are to enter the South India Church which has been taken by the Standing Committee of S.P.G. raises in an acute form a number of issues of the gravest importance for the Anglican Church. An attempt has been made to represent this action as inevitably following on the condemnation of the South India scheme, and thus to narrow down the issue to a consideration of whether the scheme is to be approved or not. I submit that it is perfectly reasonable to be opposed to the South India scheme and at the same time to deprecate the action of S.P.G. There are two different issues, which admittedly are connected, but which must not be confused.

In the first place, action is being taken in South India under a resolution of the General Council of the Church of India, Burma and Ceylon, a body which is autonomous but not financially independent. When a church becomes autonomous it means that the missionary societies relinquish control over it, including that control which, in a secular institution, would be regarded as theirs by right by virtue of the power of the purse. Autonomy which remained subject to that kind of control would be a mockery, and in establishing autonomous churches which continue to rely on financial aid from this country the societies are in fact voluntarily agreeing to continue to give them the help they need for their life, so far as they are able, but without making that help conditional on their accept

direction from England. In fact they take a risk, believing that it ight and necessary for the younger churches at a certain stage in ir development to be given the power to direct their own policy, n though it may involve them in making their own mistakes.

n the second place, there is no doubt that the Standing Committee S.P.G. had the constitutional right to make this decision, without sulting on the one hand the parishes and individuals who provide money, among whom it can only be said there is wide divergence opinion, or on the other hand the missionaries themselves, of om I understand there are about forty, of whom only one is willing to co-operate in the union scheme. But this must raise ve doubts whether S.P.G. has the right constitution, since this ects an attitude to "foreign missions" more in keeping with the as of a hundred years ago than with those of to-day, the ideas of a e when missionaries were sent out under the control of the home e instead of going as fellow-workers with the members of an inde- dent indigenous church.

Thirdly, the fact that it is possible for a minority group in the glican Church to take this kind of decision in the affairs of a sister rch raises the question whether the Missionary Society is any ger the right kind of body through which to conduct the relation- s of the Church of England with other churches of our own or of er communions. It would certainly seem reasonable that when a rch becomes autonomous its relations should then be with the urch of England itself, so that any action taken in regard to it is a tter for the whole Church. The Church of South India is, under d, a fruit of Anglican missionary endeavour, and Anglicans take de in it as such, and are not greatly concerned with whether the ly responsible is C.M.S. or S.P.G. We resent a blow aimed at it by arty without the approval of the Church as a whole, because we l they ought not to be in a position to do any such thing. It may hat this will at last force us to think seriously about the anomalies he present missionary set-up.

ourthly and most fundamentally, the decision of S.P.G. Standing mmittee, though taken no doubt on high theological grounds, bears as an act of treachery and offends the ethical instincts of the mon man. The Archbishop of Canterbury, at the general meeting S.P.G., said: "The one act of treachery would be the withdrawal he Anglican element." We are moving on very dangerous ground en our theological reasoning leads us to decisions of doubtful rality. Jesus' ethical teaching is not subtle. Rather He upheld the gment of the common man against that of the theological casuists is day (Luke x, 21). We must therefore be particularly ware when clesiastical arguments lead us to conclusions which seem, on the of them, to offend against conscience. The S.P.G. decision is the ical outcome of a certain type of theological reasoning, which sued with uncritical enthusiasm condemns as theologically naïve argument which rests largely on common sense and ordinary ality. Nothing is more calculated to drive a wedge between clergy laity than an ecclesiastical casuistry which offends the instinctive

morality of ordinary people. The majority of Anglicans will put up with a great deal for the sake of avoiding a fuss. But the limit to their patience is reached when someone tries to force them into a position or a course of action which they believe to be wrong. For nothing which is morally wrong can be ecclesiastically correct, and, if the New Testament is any guide, moral considerations usually give us a clearer line than ecclesiastical reasoning when we are trying to discover the will of God.

Yours, etc.,
A. J. Bennitt.

Annandale,
London, N.W. 11.
June 11th, 1947.

THE PAROCHIAL SYSTEM

To the Editor of Theology.

Sir,

The parochial system, as it exists at present, seems to be breaking down. The lack of priests and the fall in both the relative and the actual value of endowment income is making it impossible to staff parishes adequately.

Attempts are being made to meet the situation in two ways. Sometimes two or more parishes are combined under one vicar. This is a bad system, as no priest can really serve two parishes. Sometimes several parishes are grouped under a vicar with a staff of curates. This is better, but it is still bad, as the vicar is the only priest who is permanent. Those of us who have worked in a large parish with several mission churches know how unsatisfactory such a system is in practice.

The problem is not likely to be solved along either of these lines as the present ecclesiastical parish in many cases has ceased to be a unit, except on paper. It would be better to work, as the parochial system was originally worked, on the basis of existing communities. Perhaps I can make clear what I mean by an example from my own deanery.

The deanery of Leigh in the diocese of Manchester contains twelve parishes, which cover three communities, the borough of Leigh, the urban district of Atherton, and the urban district of Tyldesley. The following are the particulars for the parishes in the borough of Leigh from the Diocesan Directory for 1947. (There have been changes since the Directory was compiled, but they do not affect the argument.)

Leigh: St Mary. One church. One vicar. Population 10,808.
St Paul. One church. One vicar. Population 5,689.
St Peter. One church. One vicar. Population 7,065.
St Thomas. Two churches. One vicar. Population 12,418.
One deacon.
St John. One church. One vicar. Population 5,670.
Pennington. One church. One curate. Population 5,739.

; obvious at a glance that if one vicar is ill (one has been for some
nths) the present system breaks down. It is obvious, too, that it is
/ difficult for any of the clergy to get a holiday.
hese six parishes are at present entirely independent. In most of
n the vicar is single-handed and has the responsibility for the
sight of all parochial organizations. He preaches twice on Sun-
s and usually speaks on Sunday afternoons as well. The ruri-
anal chapter does bring the clergy together from time to time, but
n man is so busy in his own parish that he has little time for
thing outside.
ly suggestion is this: Leigh should be one parish. The vicar of
nother church should be Vicar and Dean of Leigh. The remain-
vicars should be Vicars of Leigh in charge of St Paul's or St
's, etc. The curates would be curates of Leigh attached to All
ts' Mission or to one of the districts. The dean and vicars would
ther form a chapter, of which the curates would be non-voting
mbers. The chapter would be responsible for the church life of the
le parish. It would meet one morning every week for common
er, study, and counsel. Each member of the chapter might have
general oversight of one department throughout the parish—
day schools, Sunday schools, men's work, etc. Some of the organ-
ions, such as the M.U., which is large, would still meet by districts.
ers, such as the C.E.M.S., whose numbers are not so large,
ld meet together. Sunday school teachers' preparation classes
ld be held together at some central place. Confirmation classes
ld be held in the districts, although for some of the classes the
rict groups might well meet together. Preaching arrangements
ld be made by the chapter. Normally a man would not preach
e on one Sunday in the same church. This would improve the
lity of the sermons. Few men can prepare two really good
ons for the one day. It would also give the laity the opportunity
earing the Gospel presented from different points of view.
or week-night services in Lent or at other times the whole parish
ld come together. Instead of seven separate services with a few
ple at each, the clergy changing round with each other, as has to
one now, there would be one large group at the centre. This
ld give the clergy the opportunity they get all too rarely at
ent of hearing the sermons of others. If it is objected that people
ld not come to the centre for such services, it can be pointed out
they already do so for their shopping and their amusements. But
aps the greatest advantage would be to the clergy themselves. If
re, as most of us are, single-handed for year after year, we cannot
becoming either a little dictatorial or a little cranky or more
a little defeatist. We need the inspiration of being one of a
., but we also need more responsibility than the curate on a large
can or ought to have.
ould the position in man-power or in finance become worse than
resent, such a scheme could be adapted to meet the situation. By
gering the times of celebration of Holy Communion four priests,
an emergency three, could supply all seven churches, and with

the help of lay readers the evening services could be kept going without difficulty. A similar scheme could be worked out for each of the urban districts of Atherton and Tyldesley.

Such a plan would have the great advantage that, given goodwill—and in this particular case there is abundant goodwill—the bishop could put such a scheme into operation on a voluntary basis immediately, without having to make any legal change in the position of the present parishes. Such change would ultimately be desirable, as would a reorganization of endowments; but neither would be necessary for the scheme to be brought into operation.

The principles underlying the scheme are two: (1) The parish should be a real community and not an artificial unit; (2) the clergy should work together in groups rather than in isolation. The first principle would be more difficult to apply in a large city or in a purely rural area, but it should not be impossible. If nothing is done we are in danger of collapsing under the weight of our own organization.

Yours, etc.,
C. K. K. Prosser.

Howe Bridge Vicarage,
Atherton,
Manchester.
May 22nd, 1947.

BOOK REVIEWS

The Person and Place of Jesus Christ. By P. T. Forsyth. Independent Press, Ltd. 10s. 6d.

Dr J. K. Mozley, reviewing the first edition of this book in the *Journal of Theological Studies* of January, 1911, described it as the most important English contribution to the fundamental problem of theology since Moberly's *Atonement and Personality*, which had appeared in 1901. The comparison is significant, for Forsyth's book is much more than a work on Christological doctrine, just as Moberly's is more than a treatise on the Atonement. Forsyth has some hard things to say of "Athanasianism," but he is himself genuinely Athanasian in his insistence upon the soteriological necessity for a true statement of the doctrine of the person of Christ. The cross is the avenue to the incarnation and the incarnation the foundation of the cross (pp. 239-40). The argument is buttressed by a robust and refreshing appeal to the evidence of experience. He knows he is on dangerous ground here, but he is too candid to avoid the consequences of "the most crucial and classic experience of my moral self, my conscience, my real, surest me," which is but a repetition or prolongation of the apostolic experience of forgiveness. Forsyth, a true child of the Reformation, can appeal without shyness to this experience, and the pages in which he defends its validity (195-200) are among the most illuminating in the book.

The emphasis he places over and over again on the Incarnation

oral act makes it look at one point as though he were prepared join in the liberal hue and cry against the metaphysic of lcedon. There is an ominous reference on page 217 to "the lern growth of psychology," and on page 234 he criticizes the ormers for taking over "the substance of the old theology about divine nature" which "leaves the conscience untouched, though ay move the imagination to the most magnificent ritual in the ld, and the intellect to the most architectonic orthodoxy." But his ern is not to get rid of metaphysic, but to re-express it in moral s. "Any metaphysic involved (*i.e.*, in Christology) must be the physic of redemption, which is only the superlative of a meta- ic of ethics" (p. 332). And in the last pages of the book he comes magnificent statement of the need for a metaphysic and its true e. "A metaphysic of some kind is bound up with a Christ of this (*i.e.*, who has established a new relation between God and man). hout some metaphysic you have not a base for that mystical ation of Christ which is so much more than divine ethic." After he Chalcedonian definition was a barrier against heresy rather a final specification of the truth, and if a new metaphysic can nd more effectively the truth Chalcedon was concerned to safe- d, orthodox theologians need not complain.

haps most impressive of all is his treatment of *kenosis* with its elative *plerosis* in the last two chapters of the book. By a moral f love in the pre-mundane sphere Christ renounced the glory of heavenly state, and in the condition of His humanity He won . by obedience, that which was always His by right. "He became t He was, and not merely what it was in Him possibly to be" 11). Self-retraction or self-reduction would better describe this l decision than self-emptying, for it was itself an act of omni- nce. Forsyth's case does not rest on the *Philippians* passage so h as on the logical necessity for a *kenosis* if the life of Christ is ve full moral value. Stressing as he does the pre-mundane act, uards his theory from some of its more obvious criticisms; his ssion of our Lord's knowledge on pages 310-11 does not seem to reconcilable with that by Mr Mascall (*Christ, the Christian, and hurch*, pp. 56-60), who rejects all forms of kenoticism; and his ment of the impeccability of our Lord is arresting in its sheer licity (pp. 301-5).

rsyth is open to criticism. He is unfair, I think, to the early ch. "The object of redemption in the creed-making age was less rgive man than to immortalize him, less to convert him than to him" (p. 331). There is truth in this, of course, but only a al truth. The same lack of balance makes it possible for him to hat "the tradition of the Christendom created by the Gospel of t . . . became most explicit in evangelical Protestantism," and fer, in tell-tale phrase, to "the marrow of Christianity, running gh Paul, Athanasius, Anselm, Luther, Schleiermacher, Wesley." e are hints on pages 39 and 304 that he does not sufficiently ve the implications of the Incarnation for the social order. Again, elieves in the Church, and he believes wholeheartedly in the

Apostles' apprehension and exposition of the faith which created the Church; but his doctrine of the apostolic authority prolonged in the canon of Scripture hangs precariously in the air for want of any basis in a prolongation of that same authority in the apostolic ministry (pp. 20, 138-41).

But most impressive is Forsyth's extraordinarily acute appreciation of the theological tendencies of his day. Writing in the heyday of the historical and liberal school, he saw its limitations and its dangers very clearly, and even seems to have foreseen, and in his apologetic forestalled, some of its later developments. His remarks on pages 59 and 167-8, for example, indicate that he was forearmed if not forewarned against the form critics; and on page 84 he places his finger fairly and squarely on the point: "The greatest issue for the moment is within the Christian pale; it is not between Christianity and the world. It is the issue between theological liberalism (which is practically unitarian) and a free but positive theology, which is essentially evangelical." We who have seen the liberal era, in more than a theological sense, draw to its close, and who stand perhaps on the verge of an even greater conflict, cannot but salute with gratitude and reverence this great theologian, and with him that Nonconformist tradition which nurtured his burning piety, kindled his rugged eloquence, and sharpened his prophetic insight.

R. Cant.

Durham.

Moses. By Martin Buber. East and West Library. 12s. 6d.

For long the figure of Moses has receded into the mists of scholarship, and where he has been accepted as an historical person he has been allowed but little secure place on the stage of history. Here Professor Buber, who holds the Chair of Social Philosophy in the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, and who is well known as a profound thinker and as the translator of the Bible into German, as well as for his leadership in the Chasidic movement in Judaism, endeavours to restore that figure of Moses to its true proportions. He writes as a scholar familiar with all the literature of the subject and the notes which are gathered together at the end of the volume bear some testimony to this. In his task of rehabilitating the historical character of Moses he has the cordial sympathy and support of the reviewer, who has himself on a lesser scale essayed the same task.

Throughout this book the substance of the traditions found in the Pentateuch is accepted, though the details are not seldom rejected. Thus Professor Buber regards the slaying of the children and the rescue of Moses in infancy as legend, though he accepts the tradition of his nurture at the Egyptian Court as historical. He rejects the story of the elaborate Tabernacle in the wilderness as unhistorical while accepting the story of the Golden Calf as reliable. He is thus sometimes to be found in agreement with most modern scholars and sometimes in disagreement. That even the earliest traditions have been in some measure transformed is doubtless correct, and we c

y speculate as to the precise core of history which they contain. us Professor Buber resolves the story of the death of the Egyptian -born into the death of Pharaoh's first-born. This is achieved hout discussion or the offering of any reasons, and it presumably resents what he regards as the likely nucleus of the tradition. But dismissal of the Tabernacle, to which so much space is given in Pentateuch, is quite another matter. This is not merely a swelling radition of some historical kernel, but an account which is found by side in the tradition, in its present form, with the simpler ount of the Tent, which Professor Buber accepts. Here he is in agreement with most modern schools, but he dissents from their on while offering none of his own. For he dismisses the critical nciples of the school of Wellhausen, but neither formulates nor ends any alternative principles of his own. This is an undoubted kness of his work, giving the impression that he uses what he hes to use, and ignores what will not serve his purpose. It would e been a gain if he had defined the critical principles on which approached his sources at the outset.

n the course of his work he presents a great variety of interesting ws. The widely accepted view that Yahweh was worshipped by the nites before Moses introduced his worship to the Israelites is sted with great vigour. Here the reviewer is unable to agree with author, though he hastens to add that he resists as strongly as fessor Buber any idea that the work of Moses in this sphere was ely to mediate Kenite religion to Israelites. That Moses gave a damentally new character to the religion of Israel, not shared h any Kenite Yahwism, seems to him quite certain. On the ques- n of the meaning of the name Yahweh, Professor Buber follows view that it simply means "O he." This view was proposed some rs ago by the Norwegian Professor Mowinckel, as Buber notes, l more recently it has been independently advanced by the erican scholar Professor J. A. Montgomery.[1]

he establishment of the Sabbath is attributed quite firmly to ses. The common connexion of the Sabbath with the Babylonian *battu* is allowed but limited validity. For though Moses took hold omething that was already in existence, it is here maintained that gave it a fundamentally new character. It will be observed that e Professor Buber adopts an attitude similar to that of the re- wer in the matter of the Kenite worship of Yahweh. What is of mary importance is not a name or a form, but the significance h which it is invested.

he obscure pericope found in Ex. iv, 24-26 is interpreted in tion to the Arabic meaning of the root from which the word dered *bridegroom,* in "A bridegroom of blood art thou," is ived. That root means to *circumcise.* Recently the late Professor annes de Groot made the same connexion, though in a view ich differed in many particulars from that of Professor Buber.[2]

[1] *Journal of Biblical Literature,* lxiii, 1944, pp. 161-3.
[2] "The Story of the Bloody Husband," in *Oudtestamentische Studiën,* ii, 3.

The chapter in which the latter deals with this is entitled "Divine Demonism," and its value lies rather in its psychological penetration than merely in the suggestion just recorded.

Throughout the book, indeed, there is a mystical quality that gives a fascination to it all, and agreement or disagreement here or there with critical opinions expressed does not mar appreciation of a work in which Moses becomes once more a fully historical character. Very welcome is the recognition of his prophetic character. Here again most recent writers on prophecy are content to give him passing mention in this character, or to deny that he is rightly regarded as a prophet. But Professor Buber insists that while Moses was more than a prophet he was a prophet whose mission was as truly prophetic in its quality as that of the canonical prophets. It may be noted, indeed, that it is not merely a late tradition which applies the word "prophet" to him. The essential character of the story reveals his prophetic quality. The experience of vocation, which is recognized to have been of such importance to the prophet, was given to Moses, and he as much as any prophet was charged with the word of God and became an extension of the divine personality. His work was not alone that of leader and lawgiver. He both announced deliverance beforehand and interpreted that deliverance, and in the events in which he played a part and their interpretation lay the seeds of all the religious development of Israel. As a religious figure he is of the profoundest significance, and without his work as their foundation none of the prophets could have built.

It is significant of present-day publishing difficulties that the title-page bears the date 1946, while the cover is dated 1947. The publisher states that the book was translated by I. M. Laski, but of this there appears to be no record in the volume itself. The best tribute to the translator is the fact that it does not read like a translation.

H. H. Rowley.

Manchester University.

A Treatise on Language. By Alexander Bryan Johnson. Edited, with a Critical Essay, by David Rynin. University of California Press. (Cambridge University Press.) £1 7s. 6d.

A Digest of Purposive Values. By Stephen C. Pepper. University of California Press. (Cambridge University Press.) 14s.

It was, I believe, an American, Mr. Joseph D. Bennett, who declared, in the course of a study of Baudelaire published two years ago, that the dream of Auguste Comte and his kind was to set up a world in which men would be free from mental anguish and the sense of sin, a world in which a man would live like a clean beast. Yet in no country is the open conspiracy to translate that dream into a reality more active than in the United States. The two books named above are typical of dozens, and there could be no excuse for singling them out except to ask what is the Church doing to combat the widespread attempt which they exemplify? Such books, it is to be

ticed, are the productions of university teachers who annually by rd of mouth persuade cohorts of the impressionable young to join army marching to spiritual suicide. Is that army to be allowed like lague of locusts to go steadily on its way?

Moreover, one of the two books has the advantage for those who t see both in their true colours of exhibiting the case for the radation, dehumanization, or abolition of man in a form of egious absurdity which it may be well to seize upon.

Dr David Rynin, who teaches semantics in California, imagines that xander Bryan Johnson, who was born at Deal in Kent in 1786 and d eighty-one years later at Utica, in the State of New York, was an erican *génie méconnu*. He has disinterred from a well-merited ivion a *Treatise on Language* which Johnson published at his n expense in 1836, and reissued it with portentous solemnity. Of contents of the *Treatise* three things are to be said. First, Johnson cied that language becomes meaningless whenever it is not used refer to objects inside experience or inside consciousness. He held, ording to Dr Rynin, that "a statement means to any one whatever *ified* it for him; and if the statement has not been verified it has far no meaning for him." Secondly, Johnson fancied he was an piricist. Thirdly and lastly, he professed to accept the Christian elation, but solely on the testimony of the Scriptures. Further, it s for him a "revelation" in a very special sense.

The view that we must assent to the dogmas of the Incarnation l the Atonement, but that our reason is incapable of inferring m from any premisses whatever, is of course, roughly, the view of rl Barth, and the Barthian position is not new. It is simply the sition of the great nominalists of the fourteenth and fifteenth turies. But those nominalists, once they had awakened to the itations of human reason, did not rest till they had reason com-tely hamstrung. They went too far. For even if it is true that the rmations of the Athanasian Creed are not to be reached as nclusion of any direct train of reasoning, that does not mean that re are not good reasons for accepting the Christian dogmas, them-ves impervious to demonstration, or that, without these good sons, we are sane in accepting, professing to accept, or thinking t we accept, them. For either human conduct is consciously or consciously rational, or it is capricious, and if in a matter of such al concern we behave capriciously we can hardly claim to be sane. e trouble with nominalism as a diagnosis of the fabric of the rld is, then, that it leads to the annihilation of rationality. Within lf it carries the fatal compulsion to beget empiricism, and a rough-paced empiricist such as James Mill turns out to be one of clearest exponents of nominalism.

Now empiricism is simply the denial of those existences without ich it would be impossible for men to reason. It is the denial that ngs have common natures, the common natures which are called iversals. Empiricism, rightly holding that there is no knowledge thout experience, supposes wrongly that we cannot obtain by nking knowledge about things of which we have had no experi-

ence. According to the empiricist, in making a universal statement it is from experience that we generalize. That is to say, he uses, *e.g.*, the argument that, *because* this equation holds good in a large number of examined instances, *therefore* it will hold good in the unexamined. The inference is, of course, illusory and impossible. No connexion can link the *because* and the *therefore*, and hence the latter cannot follow from the former. If the empiricist goes far enough in his folly, he is led to deny, with Comte, the existence of causal connexions, he subscribes to an all-embracing correspondence theory of truth, and he ends up in the thick of the metaphysics he thought he had left a long way behind, for he is committed to the externality of relations.

In this respect Alexander Bryan Johnson, in his disinterred *Treatise*, knew no limit. His end, moreover, was in his beginning. As Hetty Sorel in George Eliot's novel *Adam Bede*, having begun by indulging her taste for finery and admiration, is drawn ineluctably step by step into lapses more and more grave, yields herself to the young squire, and finally kills her baby, so Johnson, beginning with his own travesty of the nominalist acceptance of the Christian faith, was drawn ineluctably step by step into greater and greater incoherence, threw himself into the arms of empiricism, and finally strangled truth with the cord of verifiability. He was, in fact, a logical positivist *avant la lettre*.

Bent on professing assent to the Scriptures, Johnson was led by the extravagances of his theory of language to assert that he accepted them because they correctly described certain feelings of which he claimed to be conscious. There his absurdity is patent. For any evidence there of the correspondence which he declared indispensable to meaning everywhere else it is impossible to detect. Whatever the Bible is about, it is not about Alexander Bryan Johnson's feelings. If the Athanasian Creed is to be trusted, the old gentleman, like Auguste Comte himself, must have had a roaring welcome from the Shinwell of Hades.

PETERBOROUGH. MONTGOMERY BELGION.

A leaflet entitled "The National Insurance Scheme: How it Affects The Clergy" has been reprinted for the Church of England Pensions Board by courtesy of *The Church Times* by the Press and Publications Board of the Church Assembly, Church House, Dean's Yard, Westminster, S.W.1. Price 3d. By post 4d. It covers both non-contributory pensions and the new contributory scheme.

We are glad to call attention to *Lumen Vitæ*, an international quarterly review of religious education, which is published in Brussels. The subscription is £1 per annum, and orders may be sent to Messrs Duckett, 140, Strand, London, W.C.2.

Printed in Great Britain by
Billing and Sons Ltd., Guildford and Esher